UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,434	09/21/2005	Mui Cheung	PR60156USW	8351

23347 7590 03/19/2008

GLAXOSMITHKLINE
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B475
FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398

EXAMINER	
BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/19/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM
JULIE.D.MCFALLS@GSK.COM
LAURA.M.MCCULLEN@GSK.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/550,434	CHEUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 December 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23,25,27,28 and 30-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-23,25 and 32-34* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *27,28,30 and 31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/6/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included cancellation claims 24, 26, 29, 35-46 and amendment to claims 1, 22 and 23, filed on 12/6/2007, is made of record. Claims 1-23, 25, 27, 28 and 30-34 are now pending.

In view of applicants' response, all 112 rejections as applied to compound claims , composition claims and process claims have been obviated. However, the 112 first paragraph scope of enablement rejection of method of use claims is maintained.

Information Disclosure Statement

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 12/6/2007, are made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 27, 28, 30 and 31 are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification while being enabling for treating prostate cancer, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating any or all proliferative condition and any or all neoplasms based on the mode of actions of the instant compounds as PLK inhibitors and mitosis inhibitors as generically embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant method of use claims 27, and 28 are drawn to a "method for the treatment of a neoplasm while claims 30 and 31 are drawn to inhibiting cell proliferation as well as mitosis based on the mode of action of the compounds as inhibitors of PLK. Instant claims 27, 28, 30 and 31, as recited, are reach through claim. A reach through claim is a claim drawn to a mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality in general format and thereby reach through a scope of invention for which they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

In the instant case, based on the inhibition of PLK by the instant compounds, claims 27, 28, 30 and 31 reach through treating any or all proliferative conditions and neoplasms as well as inhibition of cell mitosis and thereby they lack adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the specification.

More specifically, in the instant case, based on the mode of action of instant compounds as inhibitor of PLK, based on limited assay with limited enzyme, it is claimed that treating any or all cancers, proliferative diseases in general. The scope of the claims includes not only any or all disorders but also those condition yet to be discovered as mediated by PLK. for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the inhibition of PLK of provided in the specification at pages 182-191.

In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various cancers which would include group consisting of lung cancer, bone cancer, pancreatic cancer, skin cancer. cancer of the head or neck, cutaneous or intraocular melanoma, uterine

cancer, ovarian cancer, rectal cancer, cancer of the anal region. stomach cancer, colon cancer, breast cancer, uterine cancer, carcinoma of the fallopian tubes, carcinoma of the endometrium, carcinoma of the cervix, carcinoma of the vagina, carcinoma of the vulva, Hodgkin's disease, cancer of the esophagus, cancer of the small intestine, cancer of the endocrine system, cancer of the thyroid gland, cancer of the parathyroid gland, cancer of the adrenal gland, sarcoma of soft tissue, cancer of the urethra, cancer of the penis, prostate cancer, chronic or acute leukemia, lymphocytic lymphomas, cancer of the bladder, cancer of the kidney or ureter, renal cell carcinoma, carcinoma of the renal pelvis, neoplasms of the central nervous system (CNS), primary CNS lymphoma, spinal axis tumors, brain stem glioma, pituitary adenoma, or a combination of one or more of the foregoing cancers, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification.

Similarly, Proliferative disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the Helicobacter pylori infection of ulcers.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as autoimmune diseases such as lupus, AIDS psoriasis, lung cancer, brain cancer,

pancreatic cancer, colon cancer etc. are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many agents whose mode of action is said to alleviate inflammation.

The scope of the claims involves millions of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousands of diseases embraced by the terms neoplasm, proliferative disease etc.

No compound has ever been found to treat diseases of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of modern medicine. For example, as for cancer, Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally.

Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001 wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the

inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Ahmed FASEB Journal 18, 5-7, 2004.

Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.". Clearly that is the case here.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating any or all conditions including various proliferative disorders/diseases and neoplasms that require PLK inhibitory activity.

2) The state of the prior art: Recent publication expressed that the PLK inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory. See Ahmed, et al., cited above especially the concluding paragraph.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all cancers or proliferative disoders/diseases with the instant

compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating and or preventing any or all cancer, proliferative diseases and the state of the art is that the effects of PLK inhibitors are unpredictable.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all prolferative conditions and any or all cancers.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating and or preventing the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Applicants' traversal to overcome this rejection is not persuasive. Applicants have not any direct evidence that because of the mode of action of the instant compounds, they would be useful treat any neoplasms or proliferative diseases. Specification has no such showing.

The references provided in the IDS also do not show that a single class of compound because of mode action would treat all diseases. In fact, some the references suggest use of the PLK enzyme as marker.

Contrary to applicants' urging, there is no objective enablement for millions or perhaps billions of compounds embraced in claim 1 would lead treating all such diseases including various cancers. Currently, there are several anticancer agents available , all of which at least a mode of action but not found treat all cancers. Applicants' finding that such a huge genus of compounds would treat any or neoplasms and proliferative diseases and block cell mitosis is therefore should be considered as incredible finding for which there should adequate enabling disclosure. For want of such a disclosure, this rejection is proper and is maintained.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-23, 25 and 32-34 are allowed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Venkataraman Balasubramanian/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1624